

Meeting Notes
Angler Registry Database Work Group
03/27/2008

Participants:

Mark Alexander, Kevin Anson, Erik Barth, Donna Bellais, Julia Byrd, Bob Clark, Lauren Dolinger Few, Don Hesselman, Bill Hunter, Dee Lupton, Richard Reyes, Scott Sauri, Vicki Swan, Henny Winarsoo

Topics Discussed:

1. Erik Barth gave an update on the Federal Rule
 - a. Cleared NOAA and DoC, now with OMB
 - b. Hoping for rule in late spring or early summer
2. Lauren Dolinger Few notified the WG that the new MRIP website would be launched soon
3. Erik Barth reviewed the conference call minutes from the 02/25/2008 meeting
 - a. Minutes included revisions based on feedback from Mark Alexander – emphasis on the fact that the data losses mentioned in the minutes were not related to fisheries data or the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection
 - b. Donna Bellais indicated that she sent a **minor revision** just before the conference call
 - c. All meeting notes/minutes **will be posted** to the NMFS ST Collaboration Tool by Scott Sauri or Erik Barth
 - d. Lauren Dolinger Few will coordinate getting the meeting notes/minutes uploaded to the MRIP website
4. Erik Barth asked for clarification on the “Customer ID” field discussed during the prior conference call
 - a. Scott Sauri clarified that this field will be:
 - i. The unique identifier from the source system
 - ii. Used for duplicate checking and possibly for data updates
 - iii. Independent from the unique identifier assigned by the new system (registry)
5. Richard Reyes asked for clarification on the ACCSP document circulated for the prior conference call
 - a. Erik Barth clarified that this was something in use by ACCSP and was submitted to the WG for reference and not as a requirement or plan for the registry
 - b. Dee Lupton agreed to review feedback/questions that Richard Reyes had regarding the document
6. Continued (from 02/25/2008 conference call) reviews of target state license spreadsheets by workgroup members (note: I am not retyping everything included in the spreadsheets, but am including some key points that were discussed to supplement the spreadsheets)

Comment [S1]: Scott Sauri updated the minutes accordingly.

Comment [S2]: Scott Sauri posted minutes.

- a. Florida – Bill Hunter
 - i. System/ Data Quality
 - 1. When an in-state applicant registers, the form is prepopulated with information that is pulled from the state driver's license database
 - a. Applicant has option to update information
 - b. Reduces data entry errors
 - 2. Out-of-state applicants are presented with a blank form
 - 3. Phone number is not required
 - a. About 47% of records have a phone number
 - 4. SS# is required
 - 5. Driver's license is not required, but have it anyway for most licensees
 - 6. There is no policy for refreshing data for 5 year and lifetime licenses
 - 7. 3 day licenses do not have addresses
 - a. Zip code only
 - ii. Data Sharing
 - 1. There are laws specific to protecting the information of enforcement personnel
 - a. Enforcement personnel are marked with a flag in the state's database
 - b. Enforcement personnel can be surveyed, but their information can not be made available to the public
 - iii. Coverage/Exemption
 - 1. The state boundary is somewhat dynamic because it is based on the Gulf Stream, which moves
 - 2. Commercial anglers do not need to buy a recreational license
 - 3. The Snook and Tarpon licenses are not relevant because you have to have a basic fishing license before you can get a Snook or Tarpon license
 - 4. There are 26,000 people who are exempted because they have a disability and are economically disadvantaged
 - 5. There are two charter licenses:
 - a. Charter – Captain
 - i. License follows captain across all boats
 - b. Charter – Boat
 - i. License follows boat across all owners/captains
 - ii. Not transferable with sale of boat
 - iii. Information is on owner – no information on operators
 - iv. Registry Category
 - 1. Likely to be Type 3 (Included, National Registration)
 - a. Shore exemption is biggest roadblock

Comment [S3]: This was identified as an issue to discuss in more detail.

- b. California – Richard Reyes
 - i. System/ Data Quality
 - 1. Paper based licenses
 - a. There are a lot of issues related to this
 - b. In the future when California moves to an electronic system, a lot of data management and cleanup work will be needed
 - c. The sportfish system is expected to be ready in 2009 and the hunting system is expected to be ready in 2010
 - 2. Every 10th or 20th person provides a phone number
 - 3. Unique identifier is hard to get as some license sellers submit internal IDs rather than driver's license numbers
 - 4. Do not collect SS#
 - 5. Do collect driver's license #
 - 6. There are electronic systems/databases for hunting licenses
 - 7. In the process of moving to an electronic system
 - a. Problems with vendor have caused delays
 - b. Was originally planned for last year, then this year, now Summer 2009 at the earliest
 - ii. Data Sharing
 - 1. Privacy regulations change quickly
 - 2. Currently can share data with government entities
 - iii. Coverage/Exemption
 - 1. Part of a regional survey with Oregon and Washington
 - 2. Exempted shore and pier anglers need to have catch cards for certain species
 - a. Expanding to other species
 - 3. For-hire licensees do not collect information on people on boats
 - 4. There is currently no charter license – considering it for new system
 - iv. Registry Category
 - 1. Would like to be considered for Type 1 (Exempted, Regional Program) based on participation in Pacific RecFIN (California, Oregon, Washington)
- c. Virginia – Erik Barth
 - i. System/ Data Quality
 - 1. Angler and for-hire licenses handled by separate systems
 - 2. 300 or 400 for-hire licensees – better data than for angler licensees
 - ii. Data Sharing
 - 1. Privacy regulations change quickly
 - iii. Coverage/Exemption
 - 1. Reciprocity agreements with neighboring states may be an issue

2. There are 500 agents
 3. 15 agents for for-hire
 4. Boat based and private shore exemptions will be a problem
 5. Need to double-check rules for Native Americans
 6. License exemption changes for private landowners and boat license maybe attempted in 2009 State legislation.
- iv. Registry Category
1. Likely to be Type 3 (Included, National Registration)
- d. Alaska – Bob Clark
- i. System/ Data Quality
1. Do not collect SS#
 2. Phone number is optional
 - a. Phone number data are sparse
 - b. Have been advising data entry people not to even bother with it
 3. Survey is paper based and mailed out annually
 4. High quality data for addresses
 - a. Validated against the permanent fund database, which has been very effective
 5. Sample size of about 50,000 has about 3 to 5% bad addresses
 6. 500,000 licenses
 7. Manual data entry into system is a slow process
 - a. Not completed until March of the following year
 8. 11% of licenses are purchase through optional Internet system
 9. Same information is collected for residents and non-residents
- ii. Data Sharing
1. SS# cannot be shared
 2. Harvest data cannot be reported by individual – must be aggregated with at least 3 anglers
- iii. Coverage/Exemption
1. Everyone must have a license, except anglers under the age of 16
 2. License covers freshwater and saltwater
 3. Arrangement with neighbors (e.g. Yukon) for discounts (resident price) on fees, but no reciprocity
 4. Seniors can get licenses for free, but are not exempt
 5. Mail survey done in waves
 - a. Licenses purchased before July 1st are surveyed in October
 - b. Licenses purchased after July 1st are surveyed in November and December
 6. June through August is the busiest time

- a. 70 to 80% of licenses are purchased by the end of August
 - 7. Even if you only fished 1 day, you can still be surveyed
 - 8. Combination license assumes you are going to fish
 - a. There is an additional stamp required on top of the license for king salmon
 - 9. Do register for-hire boats
 - 10. Mandatory logbooks for guides/businesses
 - a. Logbook goes with the vessel
 - 11. Even people on boats need licenses
 - iv. Registry Category
 - 1. Would like to be considered for Type 1 (Exempted, Regional Program) or 2b (Included, State Registration by paper system)
7. Miscellaneous Issues that came up
 - a. During the Florida review, Erik Barth raised issue of combination licenses for further discussion
 - i. Erik Barth mentioned that he understood this to be a big issue with Texas
 - ii. Vicki Swan indicated that Texas has a saltwater endorsement stamp that needs to be applied on top of the combination license and that could be used to separate combination license holders who fish in saltwater from those that don't
 - iii. Bill Hunter indicated that combination licenses would be a problem in Florida
 - iv. Scott Sauri indicated that the idea of adding a question to the license application (about saltwater fishing) has been mentioned as a possible solution
 - v. Bill Hunter indicated that there would be considerable resistance to adding new questions to the license application
 - vi. Erik Barth indicated that he thought it would be likely that retailers and/or applicants would just check it anyway, whether they planned to saltwater fish or not, just to be covered in case they changed their mind
 - vii. Bob Clark indicated Alaska "had whole license file, with data dictionary"
 - viii. Consensus of the group was that if a combo license conveyed a privilege to fish saltwater then the licensee should be included in the states registry data; screening question about planned use of a combo license did not seem adequate to exclude data from the registry database.
 - b. During the Florida review, Erik Barth asked Dee Lupton to recount the data refresh policy for lifetime licenses in North Carolina
 - i. Dee Lupton indicated that post cards were sent out annually to all lifetime license holders and that a mortality schedule was applied to account for the death of lifetime license holders

- c. During the California review, the topic of monetary incentives for data quality became a point of further discussion
 - i. Richard Reyes indicated that he thought the only way to get good data was with a monetary incentive
 - ii. Julia Byrd indicated that South Carolina's point-of-sale partners receive a \$1 per license sold, but that they still have problems with data quality
 - iii. Richard Reyes and others suggested that it would be wise to match agent fee to data quality
- d. During the Virginia review, the topic of recreational fishing by commercial fishermen became a point of further discussion
 - i. Erik Barth indicated that he thought that the number of commercial licensees who were extended the privilege to fish recreationally with hook&line was about 3,000; these could be treated as a type of recreational license since their registry data would already be known from their annual commercial license registration data.
 - ii. Donna Bellais and Don Hesselman indicated that in North Carolina 2/3 of commercial fishermen also fish recreationally
 - iii. Recreational fishing – 1 year – pressure to exempt
 - iv. There was **general discussion** as to whether or not it makes sense to submit the entire commercial angler dataset as part of the recreational angler registry if there is no way to separate them
 - 1. This was comparable to the combination license issue
 - 2. Some WG members felt this sort of thing defeats the purpose of a registry based frame
- 8. Scott Sauri reviewed tentative data model with WG
 - a. Discussed concept of having angler registry and vessel registry integrated, rather than independent
 - b. Confirmed that states will only be expected to provide a single flat (e.g. .csv) file for import into the registry
 - c. Discussed whether to go with a more simple model similar to the tentative data model or to go with a more complex model similar to the National Permit System (NPS)
- 9. Next meeting
 - a. Wednesday, May 7th at 2:00 pm
- 10. Action Items
 - a. Scott Sauri will document requirements for metadata storage
 - b. Scott Sauri will work on structure for the requirements document
 - c. Erik Barth and Scott Sauri will talk to Gordon Colvin about course of action for remaining states
 - d. Richard Reyes will provide a list of contacts for the west coast
 - e. Scott Sauri will post NPS documentation to the Collaboration Tool and then notify Rich Reyes, Tony Straw, Mark Alexander and Bob Clark
 - f. Lauren Dolinger Few will work Donna Bellais on sample .csv file to be distributed to WG members

Comment [S4]: I didn't write down a source for this, but I believe more than one person agreed with this point.

This is probably a good point for further discussion by the WG.

Comment [S5]: This is probably a good point for further discussion by the WG.

Comment [S6]: Was changed to Wednesday, May 7th at 2:00 pm from May 1.

Comment [S7]: I spoke with Gordon on 04/10/2008 and he asked that we compile a list of all the contacts we can (which we are doing) and then provide him with a list of states that are missing contacts. He will then see if he can track people down. His initial attempt at this had mixed results.

- g. WG members will begin looking into business rules/processes for obtaining data extracts for import into the registry